

13673. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 8 Cubes, et al., of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20275. I. S. No. 601-x. S. No. W-1747.)

On July 8, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 16 cubes of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., consigned by the Fernwood Dairy, Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped from Portland, Oreg., June 26, 1925, and transported from the State of Oregon into the State of California, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Shipping tag) "Fernwood Dairy * * * Portland, Oregon."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance deficient in milk fat had been substituted in part for the said article, and in that a valuable constituent, namely, milk fat, had been in part abstracted therefrom.

On July 21, 1925, the Wilsey, Bennett Co., San Francisco, Calif., having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13674. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 10 Cases of Eggs. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20362. I. S. No. 1402-x. S. No. C-4789.)

On July 23, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 10 cases of eggs, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Hastings Poultry Co., from Hastings, Nebr., July 18, 1925, and transported from the State of Nebraska into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

During July, 1925, the Hastings Poultry Co., Hastings, Nebr., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the eggs be candled under the supervision of this department and the bad portion destroyed.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13675. Adulteration and misbranding of prepared mustard. U. S. v. 25 Cases of Prepared Mustard. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 20062. I. S. No. 23321-v. S. No. W-1706.)

On May 4, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 25 cases of prepared mustard, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Gladbrook Mustard Factory, from Wilmington, Calif., on or about March 14, 1925, and transported from the State of California into the State of Oregon, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "Gladbrook Prepared Salad Mustard * * * Gladbrook Mustard Factory Long Beach Calif. & Gladbrook, Iowa."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that added mustard bran had been mixed and packed with and substituted in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the designation "Salad Mustard" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser when

applied to a product containing added mustard bran, and for the further reason that it was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

During July, 1925, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13676. Adulteration and misbranding of jam. U. S. v. 428 Cases of Assorted Jam. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20155. I. S. Nos. 21172-v, 21173-v, 21174-v. S. No. W-1730.)

On June 30, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 428 cases of assorted jam, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Oest Fruit Co., from San Francisco, Calif., on or about March 16, 1925, and transported from the State of California into the State of Oregon, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Jar) "Oest's Pure Fruit Jam Loganberries" (or "Raspberries" or "Blackberries") "Apple Juice & Sugar * * * Oest Fruit Co. San Francisco, Cal."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that substances, apple juice and excessive sugar, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality and strength, and in that a substance, compound jams consisting of apple juice, sugar, and fruit, had been substituted wholly or in part for fruit jam.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements in the labeling "Pure Fruit Jam Loganberries Apple Juice & Sugar," "Raspberries Apple Juice & Sugar," and "Blackberries Apple Juice & Sugar," as the case might be, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason that the article was sold under the distinctive name of another article.

On August 20, 1925, the Oest Fruit Co., San Francisco, Calif., having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it not be sold or disposed of until relabeled to the satisfaction of this department.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13677. Adulteration and misbranding of assorted jam. U. S. v. 137 Cases of Assorted Jam. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 19168. I. S. Nos. 21033-v, 21034-v, 21035-v, 21036-v. S. No. W-1605.)

On November 14, 1924, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 137 cases of jam, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Everett Fruit Products Co., from Everett, Wash., on or about October 1, 1924, and transported from the State of Washington into the State of Oregon, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Everett Brand Blackberry" (or "Strawberry" or "Loganberry" or "Raspberry") "Jam * * * 45% Pectin & Sugar 55% Fruit," the statement regarding the pectin and fruit being very obscure and hardly noticeable.

Adulteration of the strawberry jam was alleged in the libel in that substances, sugar, organic acid, and pectin, had been substituted wholly or in part for the article. Adulteration of the remainder of the product was alleged for the reason that a substance, a sugar and pectin solution, had been substituted wholly or in part for the article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the designations "Blackberry," "Strawberry," "Loganberry," or "Raspberry," as the case might be, "Jam 45% Pectin & Sugar 55% Fruit," were false and misleading and deceived and